



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SP

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,858	08/04/2003	Hsieh Sheng-Bin	SOU-101US	5635
24314	7590	03/15/2005	EXAMINER	
JANSSON, SHUPE & MUNGER, LTD 245 MAIN STREET RACINE, WI 53403			MEREK, JOSEPH C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3727	
DATE MAILED: 03/15/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

571

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/633,858	Applicant(s) SHENG-BIN, HSIEH	
	Examiner Joseph C. Merek	Art Unit 3727	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-8 and 10-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-8 and 10-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 10-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauernfreund et al (US 2,485,028) In view of Wang et al (6,149,025). Regarding claim 1, Bauernfreund et al does not teach the fabric covering the bottom in a closed manner. Wang as seen in Figs. 1, 2, and Col. 2, line 4, teaches a similar container made of cloth with board inserts where the bottom is closed by the cloth or fabric material. It would have been obvious to employ the closed bottom of Wang in the container of Bauernfreund et al to prevent the board 10 from falling out of the container and to provide a stronger container. The handle is 42 as seen in Fig. 1 of Bauernfreund et al.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 10-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauernfreund et al (US 2,485,028) In view of Wang et al (6,149,025) and further in view of Nickell et al (US 6,244,443) and further in view of Wang (6,149,025). Regarding claim 1, to the degree that Bauernfreund et al does not clearly show in Fig. 7 that the boards teach the board 22 and 24 terminate and are in separate pockets, Nickell et al as seen in Fig. 4 teaches a similar structure where the stiffening

boards are in separate pockets. It would have been obvious to employ the separate pockets of Nickell et al in the container of Bauernfreund et al to provide a more flexible joint to make the container easier to collapse.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/29/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the structure of Bauernfreund et al the boards 22 and 24 are not separate as noted in Col. 2 lines 32-39. The examiner points to Figure 7 which is not consistent with the disclosure since it shows the boards 22 and 24 ending and the covering material forming the hinge. The examiner specifically directed applicant's attention to this in the interview dated 12/9/04. The examiner also informed applicant when the drawings of a patent may be an error the drawings can still be relied upon as a teaching. See *In re Seid*, 73 USPQ 431 (CCPA 1947). The case states that accidental disclosure, if clearly made in the drawing, is available as reference. See also *In re William M. Badger et al*, 18 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 1094, 47 F.2d 951, 8 USPQ 484; *In re Wagner*, 20 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 985, 63 F. 2d 987, 17 USPQ 243. It is the examiners position that the showing in Fig. 7 of Bauernfreund et al that the boards 22 and 24 terminate and are enclosed by the covering material.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion


Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph C. Merek whose telephone number is 571 272-4542. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lee Young can be reached on (571) 272-4549. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Joseph C. Mereck
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3727